

**MINUTES**  
**Superintendent's Advisory Committee**  
**Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999**  
**Public Library**  
**828 I Street**  
**Sacramento, California**  
**June 28, 1999**  
**9:00 a.m.**

Numerically Significant Groups/Comparable Improvement. Mr. Haertel summarized the previous discussion. He discussed the impact of requiring the same numerical growth for each subgroup versus introducing some flexibility in growth with respect to subgroups (e.g., 80 percent or even 60 percent).

Growth. Mr. Haertel mentioned an "obvious problem" with the five- percent of base year option, i.e., low performance in base year. A possible buffer might be found in the types of targets, e.g., flat, moderate, steep. There was discussion of the advantages of distance to target. Ms. Baker indicated that this was a critical issue and asked the group if it was ready to reach closure. Mr. Padia suggested that we really did not have enough information to make the decision at this point. He suggested that the group accept five percent of base year until there was strong evidence to argue for another option. Ms. Baker expressed her concern that five percent of base year set targets too low for schools that have not performed well. Mr. Ruiz suggested that five percent of distance to target was easy to understand, but that the types of targets added too much complication. Mr. Aiello suggested an incentive system. Mr. Castruita commented that it is important to keep the focus on all schools. "The Governor is not going to yield on the five percent," he said, "we should not get muddled with incentives." He urged the group to keep the focus on the subgroups--all students need to achieve. It was suggested that some might view as "discriminatory punishment" a higher growth target for lower-performing schools; there is a great deal of consensus for a proportionate growth similar to a "flat tax." Mr. Hayward suggested that both the base year and state average options were seriously flawed. Mr. Jacobs urged the group not to "build false expectations" with respect to the meaning of five percent growth. Mr. Lee reminded the group that confounding the discussion on growth is the fact of only one measure being considered at this time. When other data are available, the growth determination may be easier to make.

Weighting Factors. It was agreed that we still have a problem of defining significant improvement. Mr. McCabe noted that the legislation allows schools making significant improvement to share in a rewards program. The idea is to encourage teachers in high achieving schools to consider teaching in lower-achieving schools. Mr. Hayward suggested starting out by determining what amount of money would be necessary in order to achieve the desired result, then adjust the qualifications accordingly, otherwise the funds will be wasted. Mr. Jacobs indicated that it would be important to ensure that the funds are not "a one-shot deal"; if they are, they "could do more harm than good." Ms. Estrellas echoed that thought, indicating that the value of the reward may be

seriously diminished when income taxes are taken into account.

Other Issues. Mr. Haertel briefly mentioned two issues needing discussion at another time, defining schools with similar characteristics and students not tested. There was some initial discussion. It was noted that parents can opt their children out of the STAR program. It was also noted that districts vary in their "aggressiveness" with respect to student participation in the program.

Ms. Baker reiterated her concern about mobile students and their educational accomplishments, as well as the change complexion of schools and neighborhoods. Ms. Bergeson urged the group to keep things simple, to promote an accountability system that is easily understood. Mr. Jacobs discussed the differences in schools' expectations for students. He commented that it is impossible to address all of the issues within the context of the API. Mr. Araki suggested that we are "really after continuous improvement." He urged the group to think in those terms and help move the API toward that end. Ms. Bergeson echoed that thought, building on a positive theme. Mr. Boysen mentioned the "graduated reward" concept and asked whether it fit into the legal context. Mr. Aiello suggested sending rewards directly to schools with portions directly related to subgroup performance. Ms. Nyaggah also echoed the thought of maintaining a positive emphasis; she suggested that all teachers receive copies of the frameworks and standards. Mr. Jacobs commented that relative comparisons among schools (e.g., schools with similar demographic characteristics) took away the impact of the API. "We must not allow people to take comfort in relative performance," he said.

Public Comments. Ms. Baker asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Committee. No speakers.

Adjournment. Ms. Baker adjourned the meeting at 3:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Geeting  
Recording Secretary